

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed April 5, 2007, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the above amendments and consider the following remarks. Claims 1, 9, and 14 have been amended to more clearly describe exemplary embodiments of the invention. As a result, claims 1-3, 5-16, and 18-22 are still pending in the application. The Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and accompanying remarks.

Double Patenting Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-22 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of copending application no. 10/920,037. In light of the double patenting rejection, the Applicant has submitted a terminal disclaimer and the requisite fee. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that the double patenting rejection has been obviated.

Rejection of Claims 1-22 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Edgman. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Applicant has amended claims 1, 9, and 14 in order to more clearly describe exemplary embodiments of the invention in which all sides of a metal substrate are coated by a composite outer layer. Edgman fails to teach or even suggest a component in which a composite outer layer coats all sides of a metal substrate. As

shown in Figure 7A, Edgman teaches metal foil, such as aluminum foil, that is only coated on one surface by a composite outer layer. Edgman relies on a separate corrugated core, which is positioned against the metal foil, thereby preventing the composite outer layer from coating all sides of the metal foil. For multiple reasons, there is no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to remove the separate corrugated core layer of Edgman. First of all, as is readily apparent from the Abstract of Edgman, the intended purpose and functionality of the subject matter taught by Edgman would be destroyed by removing the corrugated core layer. Furthermore, there is no indication that the metal foil layer mentioned by Edgman would provide any benefits without the corrugated core. Therefore, in light of the deficiencies of Edgman, the Applicant respectfully submits that Edgman cannot support the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-16, and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

App. No. 10/758,737
Amendment transmitted June 5, 2007
Re: Office Action mailed April 5, 2007

Conclusion

The Applicant has distinguished claims 1-3, 5-16, and 18-22 over the cited reference. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 5, 2007

/Jeffrey C. Norris/

Jeffrey C. Norris
Registration No. 42,039
Standley Law Group LLP
495 Metro Place South
Suite 210
Dublin, Ohio 43017-5319
Telephone: (614) 792-5555
Fax: (614) 792-5536
E-mail: jnorris@standleyllp.com